arXiv:1503.03859v2 [hep-th] 16 Feb 2016

Cosmological Power Spectrum in Noncommutative Space-time

Rahul Kothari, Pranati K. Rath and Pankaj Jain

February 17, 2016

Dept. of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur - 208016, India

Email: pranati@iitk.ac.in, rahulko@iitk.ac.in, pkjain@iitk.ac.in

Abstract

We propose a generalized star product which deviates from the standard product when the fields at evaluated at different space-time points. This produces no changes in the standard Lagrangian density in noncommutative space-time but produces a change in the cosmological power spectrum. We show that the generalized star product leads to physically consistent results and can fit the observed data on hemispherical anisotropy in the cosmic microwave background radiation.

1 Introduction

A remarkable prediction of quantum gravity is that space-time may be noncommutative. The basic idea is that in order to probe short distances we require higher energies. However at sufficiently high energy we shall necessarily form black holes and hence loose precision about space-time coordinates. This idea imposes some uncertainty relationships among different coordinates which can be derived by proposing that these coordinates do not commute [1–6]. It has been argued that this noncommutativity of coordinates might have interesting implications for cosmology [7–17]. In particular the power spectrum generated during inflation could be modified and may lead to signatures of non-Gaussianity [16, 17].

The non-commutative model is rather interesting since it has the potential [18–20] to explain the observed hemispherical anisotropy in CMBR [21–29]. The reason is that it produces a dipolar term in the primordial power spectrum. Such a term cannot arise with the framework of a standard anisotropic model if we assume homogeneity. Assuming that it is possible to generate the right form of the dipolar power spectrum starting from a non-commutative model, which leads to physically acceptable results, the consequences are mind boggling. It literally implies that the shortest distance, perhaps Planck scale physics, associated with the noncommutativity of space-time, may currently be probed at the largest distance scales in the Universe. Furthermore anisotropies (or inhomogeneities) at very early times may be observable today as anisotropies on the largest distance scales [36, 37] and might be responsible for some of the observed anisotropies in the Universe [38–44] besides the hemispherical anisotropy [21–29].

The hemispherical anisotropy is parametrized in terms of the phenomenological dipole modulation model [30–33, 46]. It has been argued [18–20] that the power spectrum obtained in [17] is not acceptable since it produces imaginary correlations among temperature spherical harmonic coefficients, a_{lm}'s, while they should be real. Clearly there is something wrong with the power spectrum obtained in [17]. Some solutions to this problem have already been proposed in Refs. [18, 20]. However these do not really solve the problem. In particular the prescription given in [18] requires us to define the expectation value of different parts of an operator differently. It is not clear how such a prescription might emerge from a fundamental framework. Ref. [20] instead suggests that we should take a different product while computing the power spectrum. While this is permissible, it is ad hoc. It provides no theoretical justification for why a different product is used in the calculation of the power spectrum.

In the present paper we examine some of the assumptions that go into the calculation of the power spectrum and subsequently the temperature correlations. In their calculation the authors [16, 17] assume that the transfer function which relates the power spectrum in the early Universe is approximately the same as that assumed in commutative space-times. This is reasonable since by the end of inflation all effects of non-commutativity are expected to be negligible. Hence the evolution can be well approximated by neglecting the effects of non-commutativity.

The power spectrum in [16, 17] is obtained by assuming that all products in noncommutative space-time must be taken to be star products. This is also a reasonable assumption since a star product implements the basic commutation relation among different coordinates, given by [1, 3–6],

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\Theta_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{1}$$

Here the parameter, $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$ is antisymmetric and the coordinate functions, $\hat{x}_\mu(x)$, depend on the choice of coordinate system. Different choices will lead to different models of noncommutative space-time. The authors [16, 17] consider a scalar field theory in a background expanding Universe. The coordinates $\hat{x}_\mu$ are taken to be the comoving coordinates. They compute the two point correlations of the scalar field, ϕ, by assuming that their product can be taken to be the star product.

We next point out that imposing the commutation relations on comoving coordinates is simply a model. One can consider generalizations of this model. Furthermore the commutation relations, Eq. 1, provide guidance about the nature of the product rule only at leading order in $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$. One could in principle have different rules which differ from the star product at higher orders in $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$. In our analysis, however, we shall be interested only in the leading order term in $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$. At this order the product rule is uniquely fixed by the commutation relations Eq. 1. Finally Eq. 1 provides guidance for the product rule only when the two coordinates are same. In our analysis we require the correlation function,

$$\Delta(\vec{x},\vec{x}') = \left\langle 0 \left| \phi(\vec{x},t) \star \phi(\vec{x}',t) \right| 0 \right\rangle . \tag{2}$$

i.e. the product of fields at two different spatial positions. For such products we can examine a generalized product which involves a form factor $F(x^\mu - x'^\mu)$. Let us define a generalized star product as

$$\phi(\vec{x},t) \star \phi(\vec{x}',t) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2} F[(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')] \Theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial x'^\nu} \right) \phi(\vec{x},t)\phi(\vec{x}',t) \tag{3}$$

Here we specialize to the case relevant to us, i.e. product of fields at different spatial positions at same time. The definition has a direct generalization for two different space-time positions. We need to impose the constraint that in the limit $\vec{x}' \to \vec{x}$, $F[(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')] \to 1$, such that the generalized star product reduces to the standard star product in this limit. The exponential function is defined by its expansion. We may make the rule that in each term in the expansion the form factor appears on the left of the derivatives and hence does not get differentiated. However as we shall see explicitly this is not necessary for the forms we may choose for the form factor. All the derivative terms of the form factor cancel out in Eq. 3.

The proposed generalized star product is purely phenomenological. The form factor introduced will be chosen in order to fit the cosmological data. However it is theoretically well motivated since such a form can, in principle, emerge from a fundamental framework. There is no reason why for different space-time points the product must be same as the standard star product. Furthermore, here we shall be interested only in the leading order contribution in $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$. Hence we expand the generalized star product and keep only the leading order term. We obtain

$$\phi(\vec{x},t) \star \phi(\vec{x}',t) = \left(1 + \frac{i}{2} F[(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')] \Theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial x'^\nu} \right) \phi(\vec{x},t)\phi(\vec{x}',t) . \tag{4}$$

We clarify that at higher orders the form of the product may deviate from the exponential form proposed in Eq. 3. Indeed our fit to the cosmological data probes this product only at this order. Hence we can trust our proposed form only at first order in the parameter $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. In the next section we compute the power spectrum of the scalar field making a suitable choice of the form factor $F[(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')]$.

1.1 Power spectrum in FRW background

In this section we compute the correlation function $\Delta(\vec{x},\vec{x}')$ defined in Eq. 2 for the case of an expanding de Sitter Universe at leading order in $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. The scalar field may be expressed as,

$$\phi(\vec{x},t) = \int \frac{d^3\vec{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \left(a_{\vec{k}} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \zeta_{\vec{k}}(t) + a^\dagger_{\vec{k}} e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \zeta^\star_{\vec{k}}(t) \right) \tag{5}$$

where $\zeta_{\vec{k}} = u_{\vec{k}}/a$ and the mode function $u_{\vec{k}} = \frac{e^{-ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}} \left(1 - \frac{i}{k\eta} \right)$. A direct calculation yields

$$\Delta(\vec{x}-\vec{x}') = \left\langle 0 \left| \phi(\vec{x},t)\, \phi\left(\vec{x}',t\right) \right| 0 \right\rangle + \Delta_1(\vec{x}-\vec{x}') . \tag{6}$$

where we have used translational invariance and set $\Delta(\vec{x},\vec{x}') = \Delta(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')$. Here the first term on the right hand side is the standard contribution in commutative space-time and the second term is the leading order correction. We are interested in its Fourier transform,

$$\delta P(\vec{k}) = \int d^3\vec{X} e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{X}} \Delta_1(\vec{x}-\vec{x}'), \tag{7}$$

where $\vec{X} = \vec{x} - \vec{x}'$. We obtain

$$\delta P(\vec{k}) = \frac{1}{2}\Theta^{0i} \int \frac{d^3\vec{X} d^3\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i(\vec{q}-\vec{k})\cdot\vec{X}} F(\vec{X}) q_i f(q), \tag{8}$$

where

$$f(q) = \dot{\zeta}_{\vec{q}} \zeta^{\star}_{\vec{q}} + \dot{\zeta}^{\star}_{\vec{q}} \zeta_{\vec{q}} = -\frac{2H^3}{q^3} \tag{9}$$

and H is the Hubble's constant.

We next make the following choice for the form factor:

$$F(\vec{X}) = \cos(\vec{\lambda}\cdot\vec{X}/\eta) + iB\vec{X}\cdot\vec{X} \tag{10}$$

where B and λ are parameters. The form factor goes to one in the limit $\vec{X} \to 0$. It is also clear that

$$\Theta^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^j} F(\vec{X}) = 0 \tag{11}$$

This is because $F(\vec{X})$ is an even function of $\vec{X}$. Hence all the terms in the expansion of the exponential in Eq. 3 which involve derivatives of $F(\vec{X})$ vanish. After computation one finds that

$$\delta P(\vec{k}) = -\frac{\eta^2 H^3 \Theta^{0i}}{2} \left[\frac{(\eta k_i - \lambda_i)}{\left|\eta\vec{k} - \vec{\lambda}\right|^3} + \frac{(\eta k_i + \lambda_i)}{\left|\eta\vec{k} + \vec{\lambda}\right|^3} \right] + i\frac{6iBH^3\Theta^{0i}k_i}{k^5}$$

In the limit $\eta \to 0$ we obtain

$$\delta P(\vec{k}) = i\frac{6iBH^3\Theta^{0i}k_i}{k^5} \tag{12}$$

Hence we obtain a power spectrum of the form which was anticipated in [18, 20]. The imaginary part of the form factor has been chosen so that we obtain the power required to fit the data [45, 46]. We point out that the dipolar power spectrum was found to decay by approximately one power of k higher than the standard scale invariant power spectrum [45]. This is exactly what is found in our analysis. Our analysis shows that it is possible for a non-commutative model to produce a power spectrum required for a satisfactory fit to the hemispherical anisotropy in a homogeneous Universe. Our model is phenomenological and it remains to be determined whether such a model can arise from a fundamental framework.

2 Conclusion

We have proposed a generalized star product which is applicable when the fields are evaluated at two different space-time positions, x_1^μ and x_2^μ. The product involves an effective form factor which becomes equal to unity when $x_1^\mu = x_2^\mu$. Using a model for this form factor we compute the cosmological primordial power spectrum produced during inflation. We find that in Fourier space the power spectrum acquires a dipolar imaginary structure exactly as anticipated in [18, 20]. Such a structure is required in order that it yield an acceptable CMB temperature anisotropy pattern. It has been argued that this might provide an explanation of the observed hemispherical anisotropy [21–29] or equivalently the dipole modulation [30–35] of CMB temperature. Our results show that it is possible to explain the hemispherical anisotropy in terms of noncommutative space-time.

Acknowledgment: Rahul Kothari sincerely acknowledges CSIR, New Delhi for the award of fellowship during the work.

References

[1] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and J. E. Roberts, *Spacetime quantization induced by classical gravity*, Phys. Lett. B **331**, 33-44 (1994).

[2] D. V. Ahluwalia, Phys. Lett. B **339**, 301 (1994).

[3] A. Connes, *Noncommutative geometry*, Academic Press (1994).

[4] J. Madore, *An introduction to noncommutative geometry and its physical applications*, Cambridge University Press (1999).

[5] G. Landi, *An introduction to noncommutative spaces and their geometries*, Springer Verlag (1997).

[6] J. M. Gracia-Bondia, J. C. Varilly and H. Figueora, *Elements of noncommutative geometry*, Birkhauser (2001).

[7] C. S. Chu, B. R. Greene and G. Shiu, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **16**, 2231-2240 (2001).

[8] F. Lizzi, G. Mangano, G. Miele and M. Peloso, JHEP **049**, 0206 (2002).

[9] R. Brandenberger and P. M. Ho, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 023517 (2002).

[10] Q. G. Huang and M. Li, JHEP **014**, 0306 (2003); Q. G. Huang and M. Li, JCAP **0311**, 001 (2003).

[11] S. Tsujikawa, R. Maartens and R. Brandenberger, Phys. Lett. B **574**, 141-148 (2003).

[12] A. P. Balachandran, A. R. Queiroz, A. M. Marques and P. Teotonio-Sobrinho, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 105032 (2008), arXiv:0706.0021.

[13] L. Barosi, F. A. Brito and A. R. Queiroz, JCAP **0804**, 005 (2008).

[14] A. H. Fatollahi and M. Hajirahimi, Europhys. Lett. **75**, 542-547 (2006).

[15] A. H. Fatollahi and M. Hajirahimi, Phys. Lett. B **641**, 381-385 (2006).

[16] E. Akofor, A. P. Balachandran, S. G. Jo, A. Joseph and B. A. Qureshi, JHEP **0805**, 092 (2008).

[17] E. Akofor, A. P. Balachandran, A. Joseph, L. Pekowsky and B. A. Qureshi, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 063004 (2009).

[18] T. S. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, JHEP **1102**, 061 (2011).

[19] N. E. Groeneboom, M. Axelsson, D. F. Mota and T. S. Koivisto, arXiv:1011.5353.

[20] P. K. Rath and P. Jain, Eur. Phys. J. C**75**, 113 (2015); arXiv:1407.1714.

[21] H. Eriksen, *et al.*, The Astrophysical Journal **605**, 14 (2004).

[22] H. Eriksen,*et al.*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters **660**, L81 (2007).

[23] F. Hansen, *et al.*, The Astrophysical Journal **704**, 1448 (2009).

[24] A. Erickcek, S. Carroll and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123520 (2008).

[25] F. Paci, *et al.*, 2013 [arXiv:1301.5195]

[26] F. Schmidt and L. Hui, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 011301 (2013).

[27] P. A. R. Ade, *et al.*, Astronomy & Astrophysics **571**, A23 (2014).

[28] Y. Akrami, *et al.*, [arXiv:1402.0870] (2014).

[29] J. Hoftuft, *et al.*, The Astrophysical Journal **699**, 985 (2009).

[30] C. Gordon, W. Hu, D. Huterer and T. Crawford, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 103002 (2005).

[31] C. Gordon, The Astrophysical Journal **656**, 636 (2007).

[32] S. Prunet, J.-P. Uzan, F. Bernardeau and T. Brunier, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 083508 (2005).

[33] C. Bennett, *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 17 (2011).

[34] P. Rath and P. Jain, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **12**, 14 (2013).

[35] P. Rath, P. K. Aluri and P. Jain, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 023515 (2015).

[36] P. Aluri and P. Jain, Modern Physics Letters A **27**, 1250014 (2012).

[37] P. Rath *et al.*, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **4**, 7 (2013).

[38] P. Jain and J. P. Ralston, Modern Physics Letters A **14**, 417 (1999).

[39] D. Hutsemékers, Astronomy & Astrophysics **332**, 410 (1998).

[40] A. de Oliveira-Costa, M. Tegmark, M. Zaldarriaga and A. Hamilton, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 063516 (2004).

[41] J. P. Ralston and P. Jain, International Journal of Modern Physics D **13**, 1857 (2004).

[42] D. Schwarz, G. Starkman, D. Huterer and C. Copi, Physical Review Letters **93**, 221301 (2004).

[43] A. Singal, The Astrophysical Journal letters **742**, L23 (2011).

[44] P. Tiwari and P. Jain, 2015, MNRAS **447**, 2658 (2015).

[45] R. Kothari, S. Ghosh, P. K. Rath, G. Kashyap and P. Jain, arXiv:1503.08997, submitted to MNRAS.

[46] S. Ghosh, R. Kothari, P. Jain and P. K. Rath, JCAP **01**, 046 (2016), arXiv:1507.04078.